

ORIGINAL

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL
BEFORE THE
Federal Communications Commission
WASHINGTON, DC 20554

SEP 14 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

In the Matter of)
)
Revision of the Commission's Rules to Ensure) CC Docket No. 94-102
Compatibility with Enhanced 911 Emergency)
Calling Systems)
)
Commission Seeks to Facilitate Wireless E911) FCC 99-132
Implementation and Requests a Report)

To: Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau

COMMENTS

BELLSOUTH CORPORATION

William B. Barfield
Jim O. Llewellyn
1155 Peachtree Street, NE, Suite 1800
Atlanta, GA 30309-2641
(404) 249-4445

David G. Frolio
1133 21st Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 463-4182

Its Attorneys

September 14, 1999

No. of Copies rec'd 046
List ABCDE

SUMMARY

BellSouth Corporation ("BellSouth") supports the Commission's efforts to facilitate the deployment of E911 capabilities, and urges the Commission not to alter the E911 implementation process. In addition, BellSouth requests that the Commission offer federal E911 liability protection to commercial mobile radio service ("CMRS") providers, and clarify that CMRS providers are entitled to choose the method for implementing Phase I E911 solutions.

Although Phase I E911 systems have not been deployed as rapidly as the Commission had hoped, the delay was inevitable due to the many time consuming steps associated with implementation. Before CMRS providers offer Phase I E911, legislation must be drafted and passed, a process which is often hindered by the fact that many state legislatures meet for only a few months every year or two. Passage of this legislation has been delayed in many states by substantial opposition to proposals that establish E911 cost recovery mechanisms and liability protections. Once legislation is passed, E911 implementation rules must be developed and implemented at either the state or local level. In many states, it has taken more than one year after enactment of E911 legislation to adopt these rules.

A majority of states now have E911 legislation in place, and most of these states are completing the steps necessary to implement E911. As a result, CMRS providers are actively working with PSAPs to deploy Phase I systems in these states. In the ten states where BellSouth operates and implementation rules have either been adopted or will be adopted soon, more than 100 PSAPs have requested Phase I information. BellSouth is currently in the process of implementing each of these requests. Accordingly, Commission action is not currently necessary to spur Phase I deployment. In fact, if the Commission were to revise its E911 rules at this time, it should only establish federal liability protections for CMRS providers. Any other modifications may delay deployment of Phase I because states may be required to revise proposed legislation and existing laws to comport to the new FCC rules.

While the Commission should not alter the E911 implementation process, it should clarify that the choice of E911 technology resides with CMRS carriers. BellSouth has worked closely with state public safety agencies on E911 implementation and, to date, there have been no delays in Phase I implementation arising from disputes over technology choices. To avoid future disputes, however, the Commission should clarify that CMRS providers are entitled to choose the Phase I technology to deploy. Permitting PSAPs to choose the E911 technology would be unworkable because it likely would result in CMRS providers facing requests from multiple PSAPs to deploy different Phase I technologies. This approach is inconsistent with the public interest because it is substantially more costly and time consuming for a carrier to deploy multiple solutions than is required for the deployment of a single technology.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY	i
BACKGROUND	2
I. MOST STATES HAVE ADOPTED E911 LEGISLATION ESTABLISHING COST RECOVERY MECHANISMS, BUT IT HAS BEEN A TIME CONSUMING PROCESS	3
II. STATUS OF PHASE I IMPLEMENTATION	6
III. THE COMMISSION SHOULD NOT ALTER THE E911 IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS	8
IV. THE COMMISSION SHOULD CLARIFY THAT THE CMRS PROVIDER IS ENTITLED TO CHOOSE THE METHOD FOR IMPLEMENTING PHASE I SYSTEMS	11
CONCLUSION	12

BEFORE THE
Federal Communications Commission
WASHINGTON, DC 20554

In the Matter of)	
)	
Revision of the Commission's Rules to Ensure)	CC Docket No. 94-102
Compatibility with Enhanced 911 Emergency)	
Calling Systems)	
)	
Commission Seeks to Facilitate Wireless E911)	FCC 99-132
Implementation and Requests a Report)	

To: Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau

COMMENTS

On June 9, 1999, the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau ("Bureau") issued a *Public Notice*¹ soliciting a report regarding the status of enhanced 911 ("E911") implementation from parties to the Consensus Agreement in this docket and encouraging other interested parties to consider the issue. *Public Notice* at 1, 7. The parties to the Consensus Agreement filed their report ("Consensus Report") on August 9, 1999, and four interested parties filed comments directly in response to the *Public Notice*.² On August 16, 1999, the Bureau issued an additional *Public Notice*³ seeking comment on the Consensus Report from interested parties. BellSouth Corporation

¹ *Commission Seeks to Facilitate Wireless E911 Implementation and Requests a Report*, CC Docket No. 94-102, *Public Notice*, FCC 99-132 (June 9, 1999) ("*Public Notice*").

² Comments were filed by the King County E911 Program, AT&T Corp., Omnipoint Communications, Inc., and SCC Communications Corp.

³ *Wireless Telecommunications Bureau Requests Comment on Wireless E911 Report Filed by CTIA, PCIA, APCO, NENA, and NASNA on August 9, 1999*, CC Docket No. 94-102, *Public Notice*, DA 99-1627 (August 16, 1999) ("*Second Public Notice*").

("BellSouth") has been an active participant both before the FCC in this docket and before state legislatures with respect to E911 legislation. As an interested party, BellSouth hereby submits comments on the status of Phase I implementation in the states where it offers wireless services. In addition, BellSouth urges the Commission to affirm its position on cost recovery, clarify that CMRS providers are entitled to choose the method for implementing Phase I solutions, and offer federal E911 liability protection to CMRS providers.

BACKGROUND

On June 12, 1996, the Commission adopted rules requiring commercial mobile radio service ("CMRS") licensees to provide callers with access to E911 services.⁴ These rules require CMRS licensees to provide E911 services in two stages, assuming that certain prerequisites are satisfied.⁵ Initially, Phase I requires CMRS licensees to provide the location of the cell site receiving the 911 call and the subscriber's mobile phone number for call back purposes.⁶ Eventually, CMRS providers may be requested by the Public Safety Answering Point ("PSAP") to upgrade to Phase II E911 which requires CMRS providers to provide PSAPs with the "location of [the 911 caller] within a radius of 125 meters using root mean square ('RMS') techniques."⁷ A CMRS carrier is only required to provide Enhanced 911 information (either Phase I or Phase II), however, if (i) the administrator of the designated PSAP has requested the wireless E911 service and is capable of using

⁴ *Revision of the Commission's Rules to Ensure Compatibility with Enhanced 911 Emergency Calling Systems*, CC Docket No. 94-102, *Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, 11 F.C.C.R. 18676 (1996) ("*E911 Report and Order*").

⁵ 47 C.F.R. §§ 20.18(d), (e).

⁶ 47 C.F.R. § 20.18(d).

⁷ 47 C.F.R. § 20.18(e).

the information, and (ii) a mechanism is in place for wireless carriers to recover the costs of implementing E911 service.⁸

I. MOST STATES HAVE ADOPTED E911 LEGISLATION ESTABLISHING COST RECOVERY MECHANISMS, BUT IT HAS BEEN A TIME CONSUMING PROCESS

Prior to the adoption of the Commission's E911 rules, the CMRS industry generally supported adoption of a uniform, federal mechanism for recovering E911 implementation costs.⁹ The industry also urged the Commission to exempt wireless carriers from liability associated with 911 calls in the same manner that wireline carriers are exempted.¹⁰ Rather than adopt these proposals, however, the Commission deferred to the states with respect to the adoption of cost recovery mechanisms and liability protections.¹¹ The Commission theorized such an approach was preferable to the adoption of a single federal cost recovery model because states were likely to develop diverse and innovative cost recovery mechanisms.¹²

In its *Public Notice* released on June 9, 1999, the Commission expressed concern that its approach has resulted in unforeseen delays in Phase I E911 implementation.¹³ The delays associated with Phase I implementation should not be surprising, however, because the adoption and implementation of state legislation is a difficult and time consuming process. In the landline context, for example, only 89% of wireline telephones had access to basic service nearly 30 years after the

⁸ 47 C.F.R. § 20.18(f).

⁹ See *E911 Report and Order*, 11 F.C.C.R. at ¶¶ 85-90.

¹⁰ See *E911 Report and Order*, 11 F.C.C.R. at ¶¶ 91-101.

¹¹ See *E911 Report and Order*, 11 F.C.C.R. at ¶¶ 89-90, 99-101.

¹² *E911 Report and Order*, 11 F.C.C.R. at ¶ 89.

¹³ *Public Notice* at 4 (indicating that "the flexibility we gave to the parties has not produced the prompt implementation we envisioned.").

introduction of wireline 911 service. It simply was unreasonable to expect wireless E911 services to be universally deployed within 18 months.¹⁴

The State of Alabama is a successful example of the implementation of wireless E911 services in a reasonable timeframe. *See* Attachment 1. In Alabama, it took less than three years from adoption of the FCC's E911 rules to adopt and implement E911 legislation and begin providing Phase I service to requesting PSAPs. The entire implementation process commenced a mere four months after the adoption of the FCC's E911 rules when BellSouth and other wireless providers met with Public Safety Officials to discuss the process of implementation. Over the next year, public safety officials, the CMRS industry, and LECs actively worked to identify implementation issues and to draft E911 legislation. As a result of this cooperative effort, E911 legislation was enacted within two years of adoption of the FCC's E911 rules. Once the legislation was passed, it took approximately one year to (i) appoint the state wireless 911 board, (ii) adopt implementation and cost recovery rules, (iii) begin the collection of the E911 surcharges for the cost recovery fund, and (iv) commence implementation of Phase I E911 to PSAPs in several counties.

In many states, however, the implementation process has not been as successful as in Alabama. Although BellSouth developed model bills and facilitated agreements between CMRS carriers and public safety organizations on proposed language in every state in which it provides CMRS, there is only a narrow timeframe every year within which to get legislation introduced and passed. Most state legislatures meet for only a few months each year — some only meet every other year. Draft legislation generally must be finalized 2-3 months *before* the start of a legislative session in order to secure sponsors. E911 implementation also has been delayed in many states by substantial opposition to legislative proposals that establish E911 cost recovery mechanisms and

¹⁴ *See* Comments of Omnipoint Communications, Inc. at 5.

liability protections. Most of the opposition to the adoption of cost recovery mechanisms results from the view that these mechanisms are merely a new, unnecessary tax. Although BellSouth and public safety representatives secured sponsors for draft legislation and successfully lobbied for the eventual passage of E911 legislation in each of the states in which it provides CMRS, the process was totally dependent on the legislative agenda in each state. *See Attachments 2 & 3.*

Moreover, the implementation process does not end with the passage of E911 legislation. Once this legislation is passed, E911 operations and cost recovery rules must be developed and implemented at either the state or local level. It has taken more than one year after enactment of E911 legislation to adopt these rules in many states. *See Attachment 2.* To ensure that the funds provided by the surcharges are managed correctly, and to facilitate the development and implementation of state 911 rules, most E911 legislation also calls for the establishment of wireless E911 boards to oversee cost recovery and handle related administrative issues. These boards are critical to the implementation of E911 services and BellSouth and other wireless carriers actively participate on many of the boards. However, the time associated with organizing these boards and establishing membership is another factor that contributes to the timeframe required to implement wireless E911.

Technological challenges offer further hurdles to CMRS providers seeking to implement E911. Although BellSouth has tested or been involved in tests of three different E911 location systems, none of the equipment tested conclusively meets the Commission's E911 accuracy requirements. Specific tests performed by BellSouth did not meet the 125 meter accuracy requirement, and many calls were not located at all. Despite vendor claims to the contrary, location systems are unable to satisfy the FCC's requirements for locating callers within central parts of large

buildings, such as office buildings, shopping malls, and parking garages. In addition, network-based location equipment cannot accurately track cellular repeaters or certain types of microcells.

In sum, Phase I implementation is proceeding at a reasonable and timely pace considering the complexity of the process. There is no need to revise the Phase I implementation requirements at this time.

II. STATUS OF PHASE I IMPLEMENTATION

More than thirty states have enacted E911 legislation to date, including the twelve states in which BellSouth provides CMRS. Most of these states are currently in the process of adopting rules implementing the legislation. Of the twelve states in which BellSouth operates CMRS systems, five have adopted statewide rules implementing the E911 legislation. Five other states are expected to adopt rules in the next month or so and two (Louisiana and Georgia) will develop rules at the local rather than state level. *See Attachment 2.* Thus, all twelve states should have statewide or local rules in place by the fall.

In the ten states where BellSouth operates and implementation rules have either been adopted or will be adopted soon, more than 100 PSAPs have requested Phase I information. BellSouth is currently in the process of implementing each of these requests. As part of this process, BellSouth is implementing PSAP requests for Phase I even in states where E911 legislation has passed, but final implementation rules have not yet been adopted.

The pace of implementation is likely to increase rapidly as additional states finalize E911 implementation rules. Thus, the benefits of Phase I should become increasingly available to the public over the coming year. This information will enhance public safety by improving the ability of PSAPs to locate callers in emergency situations. Because E911 legislation has been passed in most states, a large majority of PSAPs are entitled to Phase I information within six months of

requesting information from CMRS carriers, assuming they have made the necessary modifications to their own systems. BellSouth is committed to complete implementation in less than the six months authorized by the FCC rules, whenever possible.

BellSouth encourages PSAPs to request Phase I information from carriers as soon as E911 legislation is passed and the rules implementing the legislation have been adopted. Phase I is not merely a stop-gap solution until Phase II systems have been implemented. Instead, Phase I systems will provide an important safety net to Phase II systems.¹⁵ The Commission has recognized that Phase II systems will not be capable of supplying location information for all calls.¹⁶ In these situations, Phase I can be provided to PSAPs. Accordingly, Phase I systems should not be bypassed in favor of deploying Phase II systems at some future time. It would be unfortunate if a PSAP bypassed the implementation of a Phase I system capable of supplying location information for all calls in favor of a Phase II system that provided more detailed location information for most calls, but *no* location information for other calls. Such a result would needlessly jeopardize public safety.

¹⁵ See *Wireless Telecommunications Bureau Requests Targeted Comment on Wireless E911 Phase II Automatic Location Identification Requirements*, 94-102, *Public Notice*, DA 99-1049 (June 1, 1999) (“*Targeted Public Notice*”) (noting that several parties contend that Phase I can be used as a fall-back in situations where Phase II information is unavailable).

¹⁶ The Commission specified that Phase II requires carriers to have the “capability to identify the latitude and longitude of a mobile unit making a 911 call, within a radius of no more than 125 meters in 67 percent of all cases.” *Revision of the Commission’s Rules to Ensure Compatibility with Enhanced 911 Emergency Calling Systems*, CC Docket No. 94-102, *First Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, 11 F.C.C.R. 18676, 18712 (1996) (“*E911 Report and Order*”); *Memorandum Opinion and Order*, 12 F.C.C.R. 22665, 22726 (1997) (“*E911 MO&O*”) (emphasis added). Thus, the more accurate location information associated with Phase II may be unavailable in some cases. See also *Targeted Public Notice*.

III. THE COMMISSION SHOULD NOT ALTER THE E911 IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS

As the Bureau recognizes, the implementation of E911 depends upon the cooperative efforts of carriers and state or local 911 authorities. *See Public Notice* at 3. For the most part, these entities have been actively working together toward Phase I implementation. The lag time associated with Phase I implementation is largely the result of the many steps that must precede implementation. For example, E911 legislation must be passed, rules implementing the legislation must be developed and implemented, and oversight boards generally must be established before carriers are compelled to implement Phase I. To date, CMRS carriers and public safety officials have generally worked together to expedite this process and move forward with Phase I implementation in a timely manner.

Despite the initial delay associated with adoption of E911 legislation, more than thirty states have now adopted such legislation, including every state in which BellSouth provides CMRS. In many cases, however, rules implementing the relevant legislation remain pending or were only adopted in the last few months. Thus, the preconditions for the provision of Phase I are just now being satisfied and CMRS carriers are currently in the process of implementing PSAP requests for Phase I.

Given the considerable progress in Phase I implementation, the Commission generally should refrain from modifying its E911 rules at this time. If the FCC were to commence a proceeding to modify the E911 implementation process, state legislatures and E911 boards may delay action on pending legislation and rules until the FCC proceeding is concluded. Additionally, new FCC requirements would likely require existing state laws and rules to be modified to conform to the new requirements. For example, many states have established the amount of surcharges to be assessed subscribers for the E911 cost recovery funds. If the FCC adopted detailed cost recovery rules, these

surcharges may have to be changed. Moreover, if the need for state cost recovery funds was eliminated by the creation a federal fund, numerous disputes regarding existing state funds would arise.

The majority of the parties to the Consensus Agreement agree that the Commission should not modify its cost recovery rules at this time. CTIA and NENA each state in separate Addenda to the Consensus Report that Commission inquiry into such a key element of the E911 rules risks freezing ongoing implementation efforts and jeopardizes successful arrangements that are already in place.¹⁷ NASNA agrees that current FCC cost recovery rules “permit the parties and the process to work appropriately...and should not be modified at this time.”¹⁸

Only APCO believes that the Commission should modify its cost recovery rules. Specifically, APCO believes that the Commission should implement a “bill and keep” cost recovery approach in which carriers recover their costs from their own subscribers.¹⁹ Such a change of approach in mid-stream would jeopardize current implementation progress, as discussed above. In addition, an approach that bifurcates cost recovery into CMRS and PSAP components, with CMRS carriers recovering their own costs through “bill and keep,” and PSAPs recovering costs through state legislation, forces poorly-funded PSAPs to shoulder the burden of advocating E911 legislation without the support of CMRS carriers. To date, the greatest success in implementing E911 has been achieved when CMRS carriers and PSAPs have worked together to fund legislative and other

¹⁷ See NENA Addendum Regarding Cost Recovery at 2; CTIA Addendum Regarding Cost Recovery at 1-2.

¹⁸ See NASNA Addendum Regarding Cost Recovery.

¹⁹ See APCO Addendum Regarding Cost Recovery at 2.

solutions. Clearly, the divisive approach advocated by APCO would not further the goal of rapid E911 deployment.

While changing the cost recovery rules would delay implementation of E911, both CMRS providers and PSAPs agree that the FCC could expedite the implementation of E911 by changing its approach toward liability protection. Specifically, implementation would be accelerated if the FCC granted CMRS providers E911 liability protection comparable to that offered wireline carriers.²⁰ State cost-recovery legislation has been complicated, and even killed, by the need to address limitations on liability, thereby delaying E911 implementation. Furthermore, extending such liability protection to CMRS providers would be consistent with the Commission's goal of fostering wireless as a competitor to wireline service. CMRS providers who must recover the substantial cost of private liability insurance are at a competitive disadvantage when competing with wireline carriers, who are afforded 911 liability protection.

Thus, with the exception of the adoption of liability protections, the FCC should not modify the E911 implementation process at this time. BellSouth encourages the Commission, however, to continue efforts to further educate PSAPs. SCC suggests that the failure of some PSAPs to request Phase I implementation may stem in part from misinformation regarding the requirements of such implementation.²¹ It is clear that the day-to-day operational demands on most PSAP managers, as well as on the managers of smaller wireless systems, typically do not allow sufficient time to develop expertise or stay current with the latest E911 developments and changes. For this reason, BellSouth supports further educational efforts and FCC forums to inform PSAPs on E911 obligations and issues.

²⁰ See Consensus Report at 12.

²¹ See Comments of SCC Communications Corp. at 7.

IV. THE COMMISSION SHOULD CLARIFY THAT THE CMRS PROVIDER IS ENTITLED TO CHOOSE THE METHOD FOR IMPLEMENTING PHASE I SYSTEMS

In addition to delays associated with adoption of legislation, the Bureau indicates that Phase I implementation is being delayed by disputes between PSAPs and CMRS carriers over the technology to be deployed to satisfy Phase I. *Public Notice* at 5-6. As stated above, BellSouth has worked closely with state public safety agencies on E911 implementation and, to date, there have been no delays in Phase I implementation due to disputes over technology choices. To avoid future disputes, however, BellSouth agrees with commenters who assert that the Commission should clarify that CMRS carriers are entitled to choose the Phase I technology to deploy, provided the solution establishes acceptable interfaces for PSAPs.²²

As the Bureau recognizes, it is reasonable for CMRS carriers to deploy a single Phase I solution. *Public Notice* at 6. Phase I implementation requires a significantly higher degree of integration with a CMRS carrier's infrastructure and operation than with any other aspect of the 911 system, including the PSAP.²³ Accordingly, CMRS carriers typically adopt an E911 technology that is closely integrated with their operating environment. Although PSAPs have sought the right to select the Phase I technology implemented in their various jurisdictions because of concerns that certain technologies will not be compatible with their systems, field tests have demonstrated that allowing wireless carriers to choose the method of implementing Phase I need not interfere with PSAPs' desire for compatibility.²⁴

²² See Comments of SCC Communications Corp. at 4; Comments of AT&T at 4-7.

²³ See Comments of SCC Communications Corp. at 4.

²⁴ See Comments of AT&T Corp. at 3, 5.

In addition, PSAP selection of Phase I technologies likely would result in CMRS providers facing requests from multiple PSAPs to deploy different Phase I technologies. This approach is inconsistent with the public interest because more time is required for a carrier to deploy multiple solutions than is required for the deployment of a single technology. Thus, Phase I implementation would be delayed further. This approach also is inconsistent with the public interest because it would dramatically increase the cost of Phase I implementation.²⁵

Allowing CMRS providers to choose the method for implementing Phase I would result in more rapid and less costly implementation, without negatively impacting the PSAPs' desire for compatibility. Accordingly, the Commission should expressly reject claims that PSAPs are entitled to select the Phase I technology that CMRS providers must deploy.

CONCLUSION

BellSouth supports the Commission's efforts to facilitate the deployment of E911 capabilities. Although Phase I systems have not been deployed as rapidly as the Commission had hoped, the delay was inevitable due to the many time consuming steps associated with implementation. Most of these steps have been completed in a majority of states and most states now at least have E911 legislation in place. As a result, CMRS carriers are actively working with PSAPs to deploy Phase I systems in these states. Accordingly, Commission action is not currently necessary to spur Phase I deployment. In fact, if the Commission were to revise its E911 rules at this time, it should only establish federal liability protections for CMRS providers. Any other modifications may

²⁵ Contrary to APCO's assertion that carriers may select expensive technologies in order to "gold-plate" their costs and avoid E911 implementation, wireless carriers seek to deploy a single technology of their choice in order to control costs. *See* APCO Addendum Regarding Cost Recovery at 3.

delay deployment of Phase I because states may be required to revise proposed legislation and existing laws to comport to the new FCC rules.

Finally, the Commission should clarify that the choice of E911 technology resides with CMRS carriers. Permitting PSAPs to choose the E911 technology would be unworkable because it likely would result in CMRS providers facing requests from multiple PSAPs to deploy different Phase I technologies.

Respectfully submitted,

BELLSOUTH CORPORATION

By: Jim O. Llewellyn ccs
William B. Barfield
Jim O. Llewellyn
1155 Peachtree Street, NE, Suite 1800
Atlanta, GA 30309-2641
(404) 249-4445

By: David G. Frolio ccs
David G. Frolio
1133 21st Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 463-4182

Its Attorneys

September 14, 1999

ATTACHMENT 1

Alabama – a successful case study

JUL 96	FCC issues order
NOV 96	Initial meeting held between CMRS providers and PSAP officials in Mobile, AL.
FEB 97	Joint Legislative Drafting team formed. Team is ad hoc and has no legal standing, but has support of Governor's office, municipal league, and industry.
FEB 97	Phase 1 requests are received from several PSAPs.
MAY 97	Legislature adjourns. PSAPs and CMRS industry were unable to agree on composition of state board, amount of surcharge, cost of Phase 1, allocation of surcharge, and liability. ¹
AUG 97	Joint Legislative Drafting team reconvenes. ²
SEP 97	LEC pursues business case on Phase 1 opportunities. Technical teams analyze various CAS and NCAS options, eventually choosing a hybrid solution. (Several CMRS providers eventually choose the LEC solution.)
DEC 97	Agreements reached on all issues. Legislative sponsors, jointly selected by industry and PSAPs, prefile bill.
APR 98	Bill passes both Houses and is VETOED by Governor.
APR 98	Governor's veto is overridden
APR 98	All Phase 1 requests have been rescinded, due primarily to the fact that none of the PSAPs yet have funds to pay for the service.
MAY 98	Fee is placed on bills mailed after May 1.
JUN 98	In anticipation of Phase 1 business, LEC begins taking non-upgradeable tandem switches out of service, rehome traffic to other switches, and ordering software upgrades to handle Phase 1. At this point, LEC has no firm commitments from CMRS customers. ³
JUL 98	Governor approves appointments to state wireless 911 board
AUG 98	First board meeting. ⁴
SEP 98	First funds are received by state.
SEP 98	LEC begins upgrade of 911 tandem switches throughout the state to handle Phase 1 via a hybrid solution. LEC still has no CMRS customers.
JAN 99	Board is responsible for drafting cost recovery and funds distribution procedures. Efforts are made to coordinate Phase 1 rollout to gain efficiencies.
JAN 99	LEC Phase 1 product tariff is approved. All LEC switches except Birmingham have now been upgraded. LEC has no CMRS customers.
MAY 99	Board approves cost recovery rules. ⁵
MAY 99	First CMRS Phase 1 service turned up in several counties (using LEC hybrid solution). LEC has its first CMRS customer.

¹ Most 911 legislation was viewed as a tax increase and faced substantial opposition from the start. Potential sponsor indicated that the legislature would not have passed tax increase under any circumstances. Justification of the dollar amount required detailed estimates of Phase 1 costs. Such costs were not available until fairly recently.

² Legislation generally must be finalized a few months before start of a session to allow time to secure sponsors

³ LECs do not receive revenues directly from the state fund. LECs receive their revenues from those CMRS carriers, if any, which choose to use the LEC solution. There is no guarantee that LECs will recover any of their costs.

⁴ The formation of the board in Alabama took four months from the time the legislation passed. This is faster than average.

⁵ The promulgation of cost recovery rules in Alabama took nine months from the time the board started meeting. This is somewhat faster than average.

ATTACHMENT 2

Wireless E9-1-1 Legislative and Implementation Summary

BellSouth Cellular Corp – Cellular and PCS Markets

S t a t e	Wireless E-911 Legislation & Date Eff.	Eff. Date of Fee Collection	Fee & % That Goes To Wireless	Cost Recovery Rules Est. & Date Eff. ¹	Is BellSouth Phase I Compliant ^{II} ?	Number of PSAPs Making Phase I Requests Meeting FCC Preconditions ^{III} ?	Number of PSAPs implemented or in Process of Being Implemented	Comments
A L	Yes 5/1/98	5/1/98	\$.70 44%	Yes 4/22/99	Yes	17	17	
A R	Yes 7/1/97	8/1/97	\$.50/58% in a pool shared with PSAPs	Yes	Yes	0 – See comments	0	PSAPs have delayed implementation until Southwestern Bell has installed its routing solution.
F L	Yes 7/1/99	8/1/99	\$.50 54%	No- To be completed within the next month	Yes	0	0	
G A	Yes 7/1/98	Not before 11/1/98 local option	Up to \$1.00 30% PH1 30% PH2	Yes – local option	Yes	28	28	
I N	Yes 3/13/98	5/1/98	\$.65 41%	Yes - 8/98, now under revision	Yes	22	26	Phase I was implemented in 4 counties prior to receipt of written requests
K Y	Yes 4/1/98	8/15/98	\$.70 50%	No-To be completed within the next month	Yes	0	2	Phase I is being implemented in two counties prior to formal cost recovery rules.
L A	Yes	9/1/99	\$.85 up to 100%	Yes - local option	Yes	5	5	
S	Yes 4/13/98	5/1/98	\$1.00 30%	No-To be completed within the next month	Yes	0	0	